DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 696 UD 016 970

AUTHOR Lechowicz, Joseph S.
TITLE Program for Male and Female Adolescents and Young Adults Incarcerated in a Correctional Facility on Rikers Island.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 28p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of the original document; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61604

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Basic Reading; *Corrective Institutions; *Mathematics Instruction; *Prisoners; *Reading Skills; *Summer Programs; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York (New York); New York (Rikers Island)

ABSTRACT

This six-week summer program assisted 245 young people; 151 men and 94 women, who were incarcerated at Rikers Island. It was designed to maintain and/or improve their basic reading and mathematics skills. In addition, guidance support services were extended for the six week summer program so that positive attitudes toward academic achievement could be reinforced. The basic instructional plan included a minimum of one hour of intensive small group and individualized instruction in reading and mathematics interspersed with activities in arts and/or crafts for a three and one half hour school day. The students were grouped in ungraded classes with a teacher-pupil ration of 1:14. The CROFT (Reading) and BASE (Math) criterion referenced tests were administered to determine student entry level skills and mastery of skill objectives. Results indicate that 81.6% of the students mastered at least one instructional objective in which they had previously shown deficiency. The data presented reinforced the contention of many teachers that the six-week program was too short for the mastery teaching-learning model. Since the skills of many students were not known to the teachers, a great deal of instructional time had to be spent pre-testing or diagnosing student deficiencies. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-61604

ED138696

SUMMER 1975
PROGRAM FOR MALE AND FEMALE ADOLESCENTS AND YOUNG ADULTS INCARCERATED IN A CORRECTIONAL FACILITY ON RIKERS ISLAND

EVALUATION PERIOD
July 1, 1975 to August 8, 1975

Joseph S. Lechowicz, Ph.D.

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the summer of 1975.

UD016970

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

2

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	3
III.	FINDINGS.	5
IV.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	13

APPENDICES

A. MIR TABLE 30

B. MIR TABLE 31

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Objectives Mastered by Students After Instruction	5
2.	Pupil Non-Mastery of Pre-Test And No Post-Test	6
3.	Pupil Mastery of Objectives Prior to Instruction	7
4.	Pupil Mastery by Objective as a Result of Instruction	8
5.	Number of Objectives Mastered by Pupils after Instruction	9
6.	Percentage Levels of Mastery Achieved by Pupils	10

CHAPTER 1. THE PROGRAM

The program was designed to assist the young men and women incarcerated at Rikers Island in maintaining and/or improving their basic reading and mathematics skills. In addition, guidance support services for these students were extended for the six week summer program so that positive attitudes toward academic achievement could be reinforced. The program was totally funded by Title I funds; all equipment and instructional materials, however, were supplied from an inventory of supplies funded by tax levy monies. Specifically the program objective was as follows: "To help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading and mathematics which they fail prior to instruction as measured by the CROFT(Reading) and BASE(Mathematics) criterion referenced tests."

The project was proposed to accomodate a population of 200 young men and women, who were either serving prison sentences or awaiting trial in the Rikers Island prison complex. Public School 189X, within the Men's House of Detention, was to accept 120 male inmates. Public School 233X, within the Correctional Institution for Women, was to serve 80 women through the project. The inmates ranged in age from 16 to 21 years. Participation in the program was voluntary on the part of the students and a selection from these was made to attend instructional classes during their summer confinement.

The men selected for the program scored between 2.0

and 7.0 on the Wide Range Achievement Test(WRAT); the women scored between 2.0 and 8.5 on the Adult Basic Learning Examination(ABLE). The students were also screened by school and correctional officials for potentially violent behavior.

Each eligible student was to receive 28 days of additional instruction. Although the instructional program, scheduled in each setting varied, the basic plan included a minimum of one hour of intensive small group and individualized instruction in reading and mathematics interspersed with activities in arts and/or crafts for a 3½ hour school day. The students were grouped in ungraded classes with a favorable teacher-pupil ratio averaging 1:14. The guidance counselor was on-call for consultation with students and teachers; teachers also provided students with individual help especially in crisis situations.

The project was operational from July 1, 1975 through August 8, 1975.

CHAPTER 2. EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The three evaluation objectives are listed as follows:

1. "To determine, as a result of participation in the program, if 70 percent of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master."
2. "To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives."
3. "To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal."

During the first two days of the program, the reading and mathematics skills of all the male participants at P 189X were measured with the Wide Range Achievement Test(WRAT). The Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE) had been administered to the majority of female participants at P 233X during April, 1975 and the scores were utilized to determine student need for the program. Participants entering the program after the first week were administered the WRAT or the ABLE depending on their site participation.

It should be noted that the proposal specified a target population of 200, including 120 men and 80 women. During the six weeks in which the program was in operation, 245 students took part — 151 men and 94 women.

After the WRAT was administered to young men at P 189X, they were placed in classes with others of relatively comparable skill deficiency. Subsequently, the CROFT(Reading) and BASE(Math) criterion reference tests were administered to de-

termine entry level skills for the participants. As instruction progressed and students showed apparent acquisition of a skill, intermittent mastery tests of the CROFT and BASE were given.

The program at P 233X varied slightly from the above. The participants were able to select among various learning disciplines in which reading and math instruction were provided, i.e., Cooking, Music, Art, Business or Survival Skills. Hence, the composition of classes at P 233X was more heterogeneous as to instructional need and skill deficiency. The CROFT and BASE criterion reference tests were administered to determine entry level skills of the women. Reading and mathematics instruction progressed in the various classes and during the last week of the program, mastery tests of the CROFT and BASE were given to measure the particular skills or objectives which the students had or had not mastered. Teachers at both sites recorded both passing(mastery) and failing(entry) on pretests as well as passing(mastery) and failure(non-mastery) on post-tests. Thus 245 students were entered into the program through pre-testing with the CROFT and BASE criterion reference tests. The results of pre- and post-tests were used to evaluate the first and second evaluation objectives through descriptive statistics and analysis.

The evaluation of the third objective was accomplished through four half-day field visits. All but two of the 18 teachers were observed during instruction. The teachers-in-charge, the counselor and the two unobserved teachers were interviewed. Field visits were intermittent throughout the program.

CHAPTER 3. FINDINGS

The first evaluation objective stated: "To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master, at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master." Analysis of the data concerning the number of instructional objectives mastered after instruction reveals that 200 students of 245 or 81.6 percent, mastered at least one instructional objective in which they had previously shown deficiency.

TABLE 1

Objectives Mastered by Students after Instruction

Objectives Mastered	Number of Students	Percent of Students
One or More	200	81.6
None	45	18.4
Total	245	100.0

The data, as summarized in Table 1, revealed that, of the 45 students not mastering at least one objective after instruction, (1) 18 did not take any post-test; (2) 13 were not entered for any instructional objective having mastered all skills measured in the pre-test, and (3) 14 failed in attempts to demonstrate any mastery of objectives. Of the 245 students, 214 were fully entered into instruction through pre-testing and 214 were measured for instructional mastery of entry level skills via post-testing.

The second evaluation objective stated: "To determine as a result of participation in the program, the

extent to which pupils demonstrated mastery of instructional objectives." Table 2 indicates the extent of non-post-testing with the participants. Of the 245 students, 56 or nearly 23 percent, did not take a post-test for some instructional objective for which they had been entered. The majority of these students left only one or two objectives unmastered: 47 of the 56 had demonstrated mastery of at least one instructional objective after instruction.

TABLE 2

Pupil Non-Mastery of Pre-Test and No Post-Test

Number of Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percent of 245 Pupils
9 - 10	1	0.41
7 - 8	3	1.22
5 - 6	2	0.82
3 - 4	10	4.08
1 - 2	40	16.33
Total	56	22.86

Reasons for students not being post-tested for certain objectives are some of the following:

1. Early discharge from the correctional institution and from the program.
2. Court appearance or consultation with lawyer.
3. Absence due to other correctional activities or institutional discipline.
4. Post-test not given to a particular student because of time constraints, or the majority of a class had mastered the objective on the pre-test.
5. Refusal by student.

The data reinforces the contention of many teachers that the six-week program was somewhat short for the mastery teaching-learning model, especially since the skills of many students were not known to the teachers. Hence, much instructional time had to be spent pre-testing or diagnosing student deficiencies. MIR Table 30 (Appendix) indicates that 1307 objectives (about 5.3 objectives per student) were mastered by the participants prior to instruction. Table 3 reveals that nearly 46 percent of the students mastered more than 50 percent of the instructional objectives they attempted on the pre-test.

TABLE 3

Pupil Mastery of Objectives Prior to Instruction

Percent of Mastery	Number of Pupils	Percent of Pupils
76 - 100%	45	18.37
51 - 75%	67	27.34
26 - 50%	51	20.82
0 - 25%	82	33.47
Total	245	100.00

Other staff members in the program accepted these same results, i.e., the high high degree of mastery of objectives prior to instruction, as a bonus for the students; passing the pre-tests demonstrated to students that they had, indeed, mastered and possessed some very important mathematics and reading skills.

TABLE 4

Pupil Mastery by Objective as a Result of Instruction

Instructional Objective	Ratio of Number of Pupils Achieving Mastery to Number Attempting Mastery	Percentage of Mastery
1101	52/60	86.7
1102	80/93	89.1
1103	42/72	58.4
1104	20/29	69.0
1105	4/4	100.0
1106	19/26	73.1
1107	42/55	76.4
1108	34/47	72.4
1109	31/47	66.0
1110	31/59	53.4
1111	3/3	100.0
1201	1/1	100.0
1202	3/10	30.0
1205	10/22	45.5
1208	3/3	100.0
1302	14/26	53.8
1305	2/3	66.7
1306	2/3	66.7
1307	0/1	0.0
1601	1/1	100.0
1602	3/6	50.0
1606	5/13	38.5
1901	5/8	62.5
1902	4/20	20.0
2101	17/17	100.0
2102	13/13	100.0
2103	4/4	100.0
2104	27/27	100.0
2105	14/16	87.5
2106	11/11	100.0
2107	5/6	83.3
2201	4/4	100.0
2203	2/2	100.0
2401	22/31	71.0
2402	33/54	61.1
2403	21/25	84.0
2404	73/115	63.5
2406	66/104	63.5
2408	12/16	75.0
2409	19/24	79.2
2413	4/4	100.0

Table 4 indicates that 41 instructional objectives were entered and attempted by the target population and the areas in which the teachers focused their mathematics and reading instruction. The bulk of math instruction was apparently placed on the mastery of objectives 1101 to 1103 and 1106 to 1110;these objectives include the math concepts of Equivalence, Whole Numbers, Fractions, the Real Numbers and the Operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. Reading instruction was focused toward overcoming deficiencies with objectives 2402 to 2406. These objectives included Comprehension Skills such as Classifying, Inferences, Facts and Details, Following Directions and Main Ideas. Generally, if more than 40 students attempted an objective, the majority of instructors directed their students toward mastery of that objective.

TABLE 5

Number of Objectives Mastered by Pupils after Instruction

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
None	45	18.37
1 - 2	69	28.16
3 - 4	60	24.49
5 - 6	48	19.59
7 - 8	17	6.94
9 -10	2	0.82
11-12	3	1.22
13-14	1	0.41
Total	245	100.00

Table 5 indicates the number of instructional objectives from none to 13, mastered after instruction by the target students. Of the 200 students(81.6 percent) mastering at least one objective after instruction, 69 or 28 percent

mastered 1 or 2 objectives; 60 or 24.5 percent mastered 3 or 4 objectives; and 48 or 19.6 percent mastered 5 or 6 objectives. The mean number of objectives mastered after instruction by the 245 participants was approximately three (3.02) objectives per student.

TABLE 6

Percentage Levels of Mastery Achieved by Pupils

Percent of Objectives achieved / Objectives attempted	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
90 -100%	101	41.22
80 - 89%	27	11.02
70 - 79%	14	5.71
60 - 69%	25	10.21
50 - 59%	12	4.90
40 - 49%	2	0.82
30 - 39%	9	3.67
20 - 29%	6	2.45
10 - 19%	4	1.63
0 - 9%	45	18.37
Total	245	100.00

Table 6 attempts to demonstrate the distribution of percentage of pupil mastery. It is to be noted that 179 of 200 students, mastering at least one objective, mastered at least 50 percent or more of the objectives attempted. It may be inferred that if the students have a learning skill designated and specified, they will more readily attempt to master that skill – and receive more satisfaction in doing so.

The third evaluation objective stated: "To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal." The program implementation did parallel the Program Proposal in terms of (1) dates of operation, (2) the objectives, (3) the activities, and (4) the instrumentation.

The minor deviation from the proposal was in terms of the target population. Although the proposal specified a target group of 200, 245 students were admitted to instruction. It was impossible to accurately predict the target population within a detention setting; it seems contrary to the program objective to limit the number of students since doing so might withhold instruction to those needing it most. All volunteers fitting the guidelines were accepted as target students.

The staff lacked a teacher qualified to utilize dramatics in teaching, as called for by the proposal. Late funding prevented the imployment of such a teacher at P 189X. Hence all eleven teachers conducted classes in reading, writing activities and mathematics classes. At P 233X, of the seven teachers involved in instructional program, five conducted classes; two teachers were utilized to provide individualized instructional attention and crisis intervention with the women.

The facilities were generally adequate. However, the pre- and post-testing materials were entirely inadequate causing unneeded loss of teacher time in making- up for the lack. Finally, the proposal made no provision for teacher training; the program based on a mastery teaching-learning model necessitated much new and additional preparation by teachers. Materials keyed to the instructional objectives were unavailable. At [illegible] 189X site, teachers cooperated effectively in staff [illegible]cation for the program. Teachers

at P 233X worked more independently in preparing interesting lessons and materials. A major criticism of the program involved the simplistic and elementary content of the CROFT which caused students undue distraction and wore away their motivation and patience for learning. A number of the female students refused or needed much encouragement in taking the reading pre- and post-tests. The teachers of both sites worked well at servicing the needs of their respective target populations.

Recommendations of the Summer, 1974 evaluation study for the Rikers Island project were the following:

1. "This program should be recycled due to its success." This recommendation was accomplished.
2. "...The development of a scale or the employment of some existing instrument to reasure attitudinal change." Positive attitudinal change, though desirable, was not a direct objective of this project; hence, measurement was not included.
3. "An increase in the number of counselors and an evaluation of their impact should be considered." The counseling program was not expanded due to budget restrictions.
4. "Vocational shops, such as building maintenance, should be operated." Vocational employment is available to both male and female inmates on an availability basis; these jobs were not, however, tied-in to the ongoing summer program.
5. "Suggestions to one beginning a program center around planning prior to the start of the program." Prior planning was apparent; however, teachers again requested that they have major input in the design of a program.

CHAPTER 4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first evaluation objective, concerning the mastery of at least one instructional objective after instruction by 70 percent of the pupils, was accomplished. Of the 245 target pupils, 200 or 81.6 percent mastered at least one instructional objective in which they had previously shown deficiency. The second evaluation objective determined the extent to which pupils demonstrated mastery of instructional objectives. Students mastered anywhere fron one to 13 objectives in the six week program; the average number of objectives mastered was approximately three per student.

Although 41 different instructional objectives were attempted, students, and presumably teachers, focused on eight mathematics objectives and five reading objectives. Finally 56 students or 22.9 percent showed deficiency on one or more objectives for which no post-test was given. Of these 56, 47 had demonstrated mastery of one or more other objectives but had neglected to take one or more mastery tests. Of the 200 students mastering one or more objectives, 179 succeeded with 50 percent or more of the objectives they attempted.

Lastly, the program implementation paralleled the Program Proposal. Since the evaluation objectives were achieved to more than a satisfactory degree, it is strongly recommended that the program be recycled.

Recommendations in redesigning the project are as follows: 1. A guidance counselor is needed for each site; the guidance person should be one familiar with the population to be serviced.

2. If criterion reference tests are to be utilized, the content of these tests should be appropriate for the target students to be serviced.

3. A more varied program is necessary at P 189X including such activities as physical education, industrial arts, arts and crafts and the use of the library.

4. More direct input of the teaching staff is necessary in planning and organizing the project from its inception.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

29

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
1101	Pre-operation Concepts	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	43	60	52	6
1102	Whole Numbers	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	69	93	80	6
1103	Fractions	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	58	72	42	8
1104	Decimals	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	25	29	20	1
1105	Negative Numbers	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	11	4	4	0
1106	Real Numbers	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	38	26	19	5
1107	Addition	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	101	55	42	10
1108	Subtraction	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	91	47	34	10
1109	Multiplication	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	82	47	31	5
1110	Division	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	65	59	31	17
1111	Properties of Operations	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	7	3	3	0
1112	Number Systems	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	8	0	0	0

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
1201	Points, Lines and Rays	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	0	1	1	0
1202	Parallel & Perpendic. Lines	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	30	10	3	1
1205	Polygons	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	32	22	10	3
1208	Polyhedra	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	24	3	3	0
1301	English System	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	1	0	0	0
1302	Metric System	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	41	26	14	7
1305	Monetary System	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	8	3	2	1
1306	Time & Date	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	7	3	2	1
1307	Metric:GEometry & Trigonometry	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	0	1	0	1
1601	Identification of Sets	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	0	1	1	0
1602	Empty Sets and Subsets	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	1	6	3	2
1606	Solution Sets	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	25	13	5	5
1901	Analysis of Problems	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	3	8	5	1
1902	Solution of Problems	BASE	1 - 7	60916	H	64	20	4	7

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2101	Letter Recognition	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	11	17	17	0
2102	Initial Consonants	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	30	13	13	0
2103	Medial Consonants	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	11	4	4	0
2104	Final Consonants and Blends	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	15	27	27	0
2105	Consonant Blends	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	22	16	14	2
2106	Vowels: Single Letters	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	17	11	11	0
2107	Vowels: More than 1 Letter	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	19	6	5	0
2201	Compound Words	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	15	4	4	0
2203	Endings	CROFT	1 - 4	60816	H	14	2	2	0

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 1 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2401	Reality and Fantasy	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	90	31	22	6
2402	Classifying	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	81	54	33	13
2403	Inferences	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	29	25	21	2
2404	Facts and Details	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	29	115	73	24
2406	Main Ideas	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	71	104	66	19
2408	Drawing Conclusions	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	0	16	12	4
2409	Sequence	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	1	24	19	5
2413	Context	CROFT	1 - 6	60816	H	18	4	4	0

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
6 0 8 1 6	7 2 0	8 0 1	30

Brief Description Results of pre- and post-testing on a criterion reference test, CROFT, was used to assess whether 70 percent of pupils mastered at least one objective after instruction.

Number of cases observed: 95 Number of cases in treatment: 245

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): Early diagnosis was carried out at p 189X with the Wide Range Achievement Test(WRAT) and at P 233X with the Adult Basic Learning Examination(ABLE).

Criterion of success: Passing CROFT mastery test after instruction on at least one deficient skill or objective.

Was objective fully met? Yes [X] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? See Page 4 of Findings.

Comments: The evaluation design mandated pre- and post-testing by the CROFT criterion referenced test. The analysis of the results utilized descriptive statistics.

Measures of growth other than Standardized Tests

31. This question is designed to describe the attainment of approved objectives not normally associated with measurement by norm referenced standardized achievement tests. Such objectives usually deal with behavior that is indirectly observed, especially in the affective domain. For example, a reduction in truancy, a positive change in attitude toward learning, a reduction in disruptive behavior, an improved attitude toward self (as indicated by repeated interviews), etc., are frequently held to be prerequisite to the shift toward increased academic achievement by disadvantaged learners. Where your approved measurement devices do not lend themselves to reporting on tables 26, 27, 28, or 29, use any combination of items and report on separate pages. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Objective Code	
60916	720	801	30

Brief Description The pre- and post-test results of the BASE criterion reference test was utilized to measure whether 70 percent of the students mastered at least one objective after instruction.

Number of cases observed: 95 Number of cases in treatment: 245

Pretreatment index of behavior (Specify scale used): Pre-program diagnosis was carried out at P. 189X with the Wide Range Achievement TESt (WRAT) and at P 233X with the ADult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE).

Criterion of success: Passing the BASE mastery test after instruction on at least one deficient skill or objective.

Was objective fully met? Yes [x] No [ ] If yes, by what criteria do you know? See Page 4 of Findings.

Comments: The evaluation design mandated pre- and post-testing by the BASE(math) criterion reference test. The analysis of the results utilized descriptive statistics.

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The six-week summer program assisted 245 young people - 151 men at P 189X and 94 women at P 233X - incarcerated at Rikers Island in maintaining and/or improving their basic reading and math skills. The pedagogical plan included a minimum of one hour of intensive small group and individualized instruction interspersed with activities in arts and/or crafts for a 3½ hour school day. At P 189X, the WRAT was administered and men were placed in classes with others of relatively comparable skill deficiency. At P 233X the women selected among various learning disciplines in which reading and math instruction were provided. The CROFT(Reading) and BASE(Math) criterion referenced tests were administered both to determine entry level skills and mastery of skill objectives.

Concerning the first evaluation objective, 200 target pupils or 81.6 percent mastered at least one instructional objective after instruction. With respect to the second evaluation objective, the average number of objectives mastered was approximately three per student. Of the 200 students mastering one or more objectives, 179 succeeded with 50 percent or more of the objectives they attempted. Of the 45 students not mastering at least one objective, only 18 did not take any post-test, 13 were not entered for any instructional objective and 14 failed the post-tests.

The program implementation paralleled the Program Proposal. It is strongly recommended that the program be recycled. The positive results of the program can be traced mainly to the grouping of target students at P 189X according to comparable skill deficiencies.